partition serving to divide the scroll interior into at least two discrete axially adjacent flows for the discharge of air from the scroll section <u>each through a single discharge</u> opening, said scroll section comprising at least two discrete scroll sub-sections associated respectively with said at least two axially adjacent flows, and each of said at least two scroll sub-sections being configured to provide different and independently optimized expansion angles.

- 2. (cancelled).
- 3. (cancelled).
- 4. (currently amended-2nd amendment) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1 2 wherein said at least two scroll sub-sections have differing configurations of their outer walls[, each spaced radially from outfacing the periphery of the impeller].
- 5. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1 2 wherein the axial dimension of at least one of said at least two scroll sub-sections varies as the air proceeds from the impeller to an associated discharge opening.
- 6. (original) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 5, wherein the manner in which the axial dimensions of said two sub-sections varies is different.
- 7. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim $\underline{1}$ 2 wherein the centerlines of the flows through the sub-sections differ.
- 8. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 4, wherein the discharge openings of the two sub-sections are substantially rectangular in cross section and are arranged in a adjacent end-to-end relationship to provide an elongated discharge opening.
- 9. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 4, wherein the discharge openings of the two sub-sections are arranged in adjacent side-by-side relationship to provide an aggregate discharge opening of substantially enlarged width.
- 10. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 4 wherein the discharge openings of the two sub-sections are arranged in angularly spaced apart relationship.
- 11. (original) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 8, wherein the scroll sub-sections are configured with varying axial dimensions and at least one sub. section is displaced axially as it approaches its discharge opening to provide for an aggregate elongated discharge opening having substantially a common longitudinal centerline.
- 12. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1 2 wherein said at least two scroll sub-sections have cut-off points substantially at the same point circumferentially along the periphery of the impeller opening in the partition.

- 13. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1 2, wherein said at least two scroll sub-sections have cut-off points spaced circumferentially from each other.
- 14. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1/2, wherein said at least two scroll sub-sections have discharge openings with substantially parallel centerlines.
- 15. (currently amended) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1 2, wherein said at least two scroll sub-sections have discharge openings with centerlines angularly related to each other.
- 16. (original) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1, wherein said edge of said inner opening in said partition takes a thin rounded configuration facing the impeller.
- 17. (original) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 16, wherein said edge is inclined gradually outwardly on opposite sides from said rounded configuration to the full thickness of the partition.
- 18-20. (cancelled).
- 21. (original) A centrifugal blower assembly as set forth in Claim 1, wherein a flow balancing restriction is incorporated in at least one of said scroll sub-sections. REMARKS

Formal drawings including new Fig. 11 are enclosed herewith.

Fig. 11 clearly discloses the changes in axial dimension in the scroll sub-sections heretofore discussed. Support for the introduction of this Figure is found in the Specification on page 3 at lines 11 et sequa, page 6 line 19 et sequa, page 7 line 6 et sequa and original Claims 5 and 6.

It is well-settled law that the original Claims are to be regarded as a part of the disclosure.

The Examiner's attention is also invited to the current amendments to Claim1 including a positive limitation that each scroll subsection has a <u>single discharge opening</u>. This is in clear distinction to Williams' 2330938. The configuration shown in Fig. 3 is of the dual discharge type wherein design criteria are completely different from and foreign to those employed in a scroll having a single discharge opening. In short, single and dual discharge scrolls are quite different animals. Thus, it is submitted that the Examiner's overlay of Figs. 3 and 4 in Williams is inappropriate and that Claim 1 in its presently amended form should now be found allowable. The remaining Claims in the Application are also deemed allowable due to their dependence on Claim 1 and also the numerous features not shown in the prior art absent the overlay of Fig. 3 and 4 in Williams.

A new declaration is also enclosed.

Favorable consideration and allowance of all claims in light of the foregoing is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Paulding Reg. No. 19294